DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 588 SP 017 951

AUTHOR O'Shea, David W.
TITLE The Experience of Teacher Training. A Case Study.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Teacher Education Lab.
SPONS AGENCY Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 44p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior; *Leadership Qualities; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Self Concept; Socialization; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Reported are the experiences of participants in three different teacher training programs in the Teacher Education Laboratory at the University of California at Los Angeles. One program was behavioristic, another humanistic, and the third eclectic. Findings indicate that beginning teacher trainees perceive the teacher role in terms of three dimensions of classroom leadership: task, expressive, and authoritarian. Beginning trainees were confident regarding their ability to exercise expressive leadership, but felt lacking in task leadership skills. At the end of the training, students in the behavioristic team were more likely than those in the other two teams to perceive themselves as having acquired task leadership skills. This outcome appears to be related to the fact that the behavioristic program was committed to the transmission of a distinctive "technology" of instruction, a technology which also determined the structure of the program's training process. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200588

THE EXPERIENCE OF TEACHER TRAINING: A CASE STUDY

David W. O'Shea

UCLA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David W. O'Shea

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 13-17, 1981

This study was made possible by funds received from a Spencer Foundation grant to the Graduate School of Education, UCLA. Invaluable assistance was provided by Jane Major who conducted the interviews. Access to data was provided by the generous cooperation of faculty and staff of UCLA's Teacher Education Laboratory, supervising teachers in public schools and the University Elementary School, and student teachers enrolled in TEL for the 1978-79 academic year.

SP017951

INTRODUCTION

Practicing teachers typically challenge the relevance of their professional preparation, claiming that "their principal teacher has been experience; they learned through trial and error in the classroom" (Lortie, 1975: 79). Such an assessment lends credence to Fuller and Brown's (1975: 25) observation, based upon an extensive review of relevant literature: "What laymen, legislators, and education students have been claiming for many decades may be true: teacher education is orthogonal to the teacher." Perhaps, but it is possible that this opinion reflects a discounting of the effect of teacher training, or that it over-generalizes. Some training programs may be more effective than others. To explore the issue of the perceived effectiveness of teacher education a study was undertaken of the subjective experience of students passing through UCLA's Teacher Education Laboratory (TEL) during the 1978-79 academic year. Studying teachers in training enables one to reach behind those already practicing their profession, thus avoiding reliance upon retrospective data.

Arguing for the study to be conducted within TEL is the fact that the Laboratory divides students among five teams, each with its own distinctive approach to teacher education. Given this structure, it was anticipated that student response to, and evaluation of, their training experiences would vary between teams, providing an opportunity to identify characteristics of the different approaches associated with such between-team variation in training outcomes.

To order data collection and analysis two theoretical perspectives were adopted. One, proposed by Bucher and Stelling (1977), specifies key characteristics of the <u>process</u> of professional socialization. The second, developed by Gordon and Adler (1963), provides a conceptualization of the teacher role, thus establishing a basis for specifying the skills that teacher education should aim to develop in teacher trainees.

Theoretical Perspectives

Bucher and Stelling (1977) studied men and women as they moved through programs of professional training in psychiatry, internal medicine, and biochemistry. In the course of their research the authors identified three key elements of the socialization process through which trainees move toward professional role acquisition. Each element offers alternative possibilities, having the potential to fit within either a deterministic, externally constrained, or a voluntaristic, self directed model of professional socialization.[1] For example, the authors found that the students whom they studied operated largely in a voluntaristic manner, establishing self-management of their learning experiences, rather than adopting the deterministic alternative of deferring to faculty control. Along with self management of learning went a distinctive pattern of professional role acquisition. Rather than identifying with one exemplary professional practitioner, a phenomenon that Bucher and Stelling (1977) label role modeling, their students opted for the more eclectic approach of role-playing. The latter approach involves students selecting specific role characteristics from several exemplars and combining them into their own unique role performance. Finally, Bucher and Stelling (1977) found that the students they studied were resistant to staff evaluation, tending to discount negative feedback from faculty in favor of self-validation of their own performance in training situations. In fact, the authors' "most startling" finding was that "trainees, when judging their own performance and competence, placed great emphasis upon their own self-evaluation" (Bucher and Stelling, 1977: 272). Overall, "the basic subjective experience of trainees was that they were actively managing their work and controlling their situation with a growing sense of mastery" (Bucher and Stelling, 1977: 270).

All of this suggests that, given an option, students entering professional training are likely to want, and to be most attracted by, programs that operate in a voluntaristic mode, allowing for substantial student self-management of

learning experiences. Yet, as we shall see, among the three different programs studied within TEL, the one that proved to be most attractive, as indicated by its impact upon recruitment, was the program with the most deterministic orientation to teacher training, and with the strongest, most centralized, faculty control. Behind this unanticipated finding lie students' perceptions of the nature of the teacher role, and the degree to which students feel that they are being trained in an instructional "technology" for performing the role.

The Teacher Role

Doyle (1979) argues that the teacher role is one that calls for continual classroom planning and decision-making "in terms of the problems posed by the classroom environment" (Doyle, 1979: 47). Further;

> The picture drawn here of this environment suggests that teachers encounter classrooms as units of time to be filled with activities that can be justified educationally and as groups of students who vary widely in aptitude and propensities for such activities. At a proximal level, then, the teacher's task as defined by these situational demands is to gain and maintain cooperation in classroom activities. (Doyle, 1979: 47) (Author's italics).

In essence, Doyle finds that the classroom setting evokes a leadership performance from teachers, as proposed separately by both Lortie (1975) and Gordon and Adler (1963). These authors derive a "classroom leadership" model of the teacher role from the work of R.F. Bales (1958), a pioneer of small group research. Bales concluded that groups effective at problem solving are characterized by two distinct types of leadership; instrumental (or task) and emotional (or expressive). Within effective groups, while one leader presses for task accomplisment another acts to reduce tensions resulting from the task leader's demands, thus maintaining morale and group cohesion. Gordon and Adler (1963), and Lortie (1975), argue that in classrooms both the task and expressive dimensions of leadership have to be carried out by the one adult present; the teacher. Gordon and Adler (1963) expand upon this approach, proposing that the teacher draws also upon a third dimension of leadership, the dimension of authority. [2]

With regard to the findings of this study of teacher education, it is interesting to note that when planning the student interviews the teacher role was not viewed in terms of classroom leadership. However, when the interview data were coded for analysis, it became apparent that students' replies to questions that sought to elicit their perceptions of the teacher role fell remarkably well into categories corresponding to the three dimensions of classroom leadership; task, expressive, and authoritarian. Further, most students interviewed felt that they entered teacher education already well equipped to handle expressive leadership, being confident in their ability to relate to children. What students felt they lacked were task leadership skills.

This latter finding eliminates the first of two hypotheses proposed by Lortie (1975: 79) as possible explanations for the low estimate of teacher education among members of the teaching profession. The first hypothesis is that though teacher education may be effective in principle, commonly it is experienced by students as redundant because, prior to entering training, they have already completed what amounts to 16 years of quasi-apprenticeship to the teaching task. However, despite the years they had spent as students in classrooms, few of those interviewed for this study felt that they had acquired what they perceived to be necessary task leadership skills.

A second hypothesis, which Lortie proposes as an alternative to the first, is that teaching competence is acquired through classroom experience rather than from teacher education because teaching, unlike other professions, lacks a core of tested technical knowledge upon which teacher educators can base "generally valid principles of instruction" (Lortie, 1975: 80). Consequently, there is no distinctive technical culture into which trainees can be inducted. Implicit in this hypothesis is the assumption that if teacher education were to be based upon

tested knowledge regarding classroom instructional techniques, such education would equip trainees with task leadership skills, and would then be highly regarded in the profession. In fact, this is an assumption that is supported by our findings, as shown later. These findings indicate that members of TEL's behavioristic team, the most "technologically" oriented of the teams studied, were more likely than members of other teams to feel that they did acquire task leadership skills from their training. Before discussing the findings in more detail, we turn first to the method by which they were generated.

Method

TEL's annual enrollment is divided among five distinctly different teams, each with about 35 students, and a separate faculty. Among the 1978-79 teams at one extreme was Team L, based in the University Elementary School (UES), and dedicated to a behavioristic approach to both teaching and teacher training. At the other extreme was Team E, committed to a humanistic approach. Between these extremes came Team S whose students were presented with several approaches and invited to make their choice. To take advantage of this between-team variation eight of the students preparing to teach elementary school were selected at random from among the Fall, 1978, entrants to each of the above three teams. Data were generated by interviewing the selected students each quarter during the academic year. Interviewed also were the master teachers who supervised the selected students in their practice teaching. Additional data were gathered from TEL faculty and staff. A separate interview schedule was prepared for each quarter. Interviews were taped, transcribed, and coded for analysis.

Findings are presented next, beginning with trainees' perceptions of the teacher role. This established their view of what they hoped to learn. Next come data on ways that the trainees experienced, and responded to, Bucher and Stelling's(1977) socialization processes. Finally, we have trainees views on what they learned.

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE TEACHER ROLE

One way to gain insight into how people view any given role is to ask them to name personal qualities that they possess which they believe are likely to contribute to performance of that role. When we asked this of teacher trainees, responses fell into the distinctive pattern shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINEES' PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL QUALITIES THEY POSSESS THAT THEY FEEL WILL HELP THEM TO BE EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM TEACHERS, BY TEAMS(a)

PERSONAL QUALITIES	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Empathic				
Ability to relate to youngsters	2	3	3	6
Enjoy working with young people	2	2	2	6
Care about youngsters	2	0	0	2
Perceptive of children's needs	0	2	0	2
Patient	4	4	3	11
Total Responses	10	11	8	29

(a) Respondents offered several qualities each. Only those qualities mentioned by two or more respondents are listed.

Personal qualities mentioned by two or more students fell into the categories presented in Table 1, which may be grouped under the headings of empathy and patience. There is a remarkable consistency of response across teams. Also notable is the fact that the qualities identified

relate exclusively to expressive rather than task leadership. Finally, it is interesting that trainees did not mention knowledge of subject matter, possibly reflecting the fact that all were seeking an elementary credential.

The responses of TEL trainees followed a pattern similar to that found by Lortie (1975) when he addressed the same question to a sample of ninety-four practicing teachers. Slightly over half of the responses from Lortie's sample related to "personal characteristics like patience, a sense of humor, leadership ability, and a calm and self-possessed nature . . ." (Lortie, 1975: 39). Fewer than one-fifth of the responses dealt with intellectual strengths such as "knowledge of a subject, intelligence, being well organized, and enjoying learning" (Lortie, 1975: 40). For Lortie, the emphasis of his respondents upon empathic characteristics and patience reflects the attraction of teaching for persons who, for one reason or another, want to work with young people and who are reasonably confident in their ability to relate to them. In effect, expressive leadership is relatively non-problematic for those persons who are attracted to the teaching profession, a conclusion supported by the data from TEL trainees presented in Table 1.

What is problematic, at least initially as people approach classroom teaching for the first time, is task leadership. Lortie reviewed diaries that beginning teachers were asked to keep, and in these he found that a dominant concern was "whether they could actually conduct instruction" (Lortie, 1975: 71).

A similar concern emerges among TEL trainees when they were asked to discuss teachers whom they considered exemplary models, and then were asked a couple of questions eliciting their views on what they needed to learn in order to be effective teachers.

Exemplary Models

In the course of first quarter interviews trainees were asked:

> What teachers, now or in the past, stand out in your mind as being particularly outstanding?

Of the twenty-one replying, six named one teacher and twelve named two or more. Analysis of trainees' descriptions of their nominees shows them using language that can well be categorized into the three dimensions of classroom leadership. The distribution of responses is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF SELECTED LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS THAT TRAINEES ATTRIBUTED TO THEIR OUTSTANDING TEACHERS[a]

LEADERSHIP DIMENSION	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Task	4	5	4	13
Expressive	4	5	3	12
Authority	3	0	1	4

[a]Most respondents cited more than one teacher.

As evidenced by the data in Table 2, most trainees identified task and expressive leadership characteristics in their admired teachers; relatively few reported authoritative behavior. There was some deviation from this in that the few trainees who did identify their ideal teachers as authoritative reported that in each case the same teacher also used expressive leadership, the latter softening the impact of authority.

Trainees Perceptions of Their Learning Needs

If trainees perceptions of their learning needs actually are shaped by their view of the characteristics of teachers whom they admire, data presented so far predict that trainees will give priority to the acquisition of task leadership skills. While expressive leadership ranks equally in their view with task leadership, as shown in Table 1 most trainees feel well equipped to handle the expressive dimension. Few see authoritarian behavior as necessary, so only task leadership should remain problematic.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM AND BY DIMENSION OF CLASSROOM LEADERSHIP, OF ASPECTS OF TEACHING THAT TRAINEES FELT THEY NEEDED TO LEARN TO BE EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM TEACHERS[a]

STUDENTS FELT THEY NEEDED TO LEARN	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Task Leadership				
Instructional techniques	4	6	8	18
Planning and organization	2	2	3	7
Diagnosis of learning needs	0	1	2	3
Expressive Leadership				
Methods of motivation	0	1	2	3
Authority				
Classroom control	3	1	1	5

[a] Individual respondents cited more than one aspect of teaching.

In fact, as predicted, task leadership does emerge as the dominant concern when trainees were asked, in the first quarter:

> What kinds of things do you feel that you need to learn in order to become an effective classroom teacher?

Responses fell overwhelmingly into the task leadership category, as shown in Table 3. This pattern of response, combined with the data in Table 1, validates the conclusion, summarized in Table 2, that trainees do view the teaching role as, ideally, one that gives priority to task and expressive dimensions of classroom leadership.

The data in Table 3 were generated by trainees' responses to an open-ended question. Later in the same interview trainees were given a forced choice question, similar in content, though lacking an item representative of expressive leadership. However, the pattern of response substantially confirms that just presented derived from the open-ended questions.

Topics to Focus Upon In Training

The forced choice question asked respondents to:

> Rank the following according to what you think is most important for you to focus on during the year:
> (a) Diagnosis of children's learning problems
> (b) Classroom control
> (c) Subject matter
> (d) Instructional techniques

The distribution of respondents first choices are presented in Table 4, by team.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF RESPONDENTS' CHOICES OF WHICH AMONG FOUR ASPECTS OF TEACHING THEY THOUGHT IT MOST IMPORTANT TO FOCUS UPON DURING THEIR TRAINING YEAR

DIMENSION OF TEACHING	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Diagnosis of children's learning problems	2	6	3	11
Instructional techniques	5	2	2	9
Classroom control	1	0	1	2
Subject matter	0	0	1	1
No reply	0	0	1	1

Dominating the responses presented in Table 4 are, again, aspects of teaching that fit within the task leadership dimension. Diagnosis of learning problems, and instructional techniques, are key components of task leadership. As before, classroom control is not viewed as problematic by this group, and neither is subject matter.

We turn next to the training process itself through which trainees hope to acquire the needed skills. As the training program aims to transmit these skills within the context of specific conceptual frameworks, discussion focusses initially upon the degree of structural and conceptual integration of training within each of the three teams.

THE TRAINING PROCESS: STRUCTURAL AND CONCEPTUAL INTEGRATION

While data presented so far show trainees sharing a common perception of the teacher role in terms of dimensions of classroom leadership, and agreeing that task leadership skills were their priority need, when we turn to trainees' reports of how they experienced the process of role acquisition we find distinctive between-team differences. While these differences reflect variation between teams in the degree to which they integrate the different parts of the training process, structurally and conceptually, such integration itself is a function of the way team faculty define the teacher training task.

Among the three teams studied Team L evidenced the closest structural and conceptual integration; Teams E and S the least. Underlying this difference is the fact that within Team L the teacher role is conceived in technological terms, a fact that takes on great importance in the light of Lortie's (1975) hypothesis presented earlier. Trainees in Team L are systematically introduced into the use of theoretically grounded rules for modifying pupil behavior, with regard both to learning tasks and social conduct. In effect, trainees receive a closely supervised apprenticeship in the application of instructional rules grounded in behaviorist theory. In the course of this apprenticeship, trainees learn how to apply the rules in ways likely to ensure continuous positive reinforcement of pupil learning and self-discipline. To monitor pupil progress, trainees learn how to elicit feedback within the framework of each lesson, or unit of instruction. This feedback becomes the basis for deciding upon the next steps in the instructional process. As Team L's statement of purpose reads:

> In order to maximize the probability of learning, teachers must utilize the principles of human learning that have been validated by research.

To help trainees in this regard,

> psychological and educational theories are constantly translated into practice (Thayer, 1978:53).

This rather intense commitment to translating theory into practice is unique to Team L. By contrast, trainees in the eclectically oriented Team S are encouraged to:

> develop their own instructional approaches, by borrowing from a variety of different methods and techniques (Thayer, 1978:52).

And finally, trainees in the even less technically oriented, humanistic, Team E are invited to focus upon:

> issues related to personal growth, self-awareness, and interpersonal relations (Thayer, 1978:52).

While each team has its own distinctive conceptual orientation, only in Team L is the team orientation integrated across academic courses, clinical instruction and student teaching. To achieve this conceptual integration requires parallel structural integration, with centralized control of all components of the training process.

Structural Integration

In terms of the major components of the training process, Team L exhibits the most tightly coupled structure. Control is centralized in team faculty at University Elementary School (UES). Team faculty, of course, teach the required team specific courses in psychology and curriculum theory, as in Teams E and S. However, unlike the latter two, in Team L the clinical courses in the teaching of special topics such as reading, mathematics, and science, also are controlled by team faculty, being assigned to UES teachers, or teachers trained at UES. Similarly, first quarter field observation and second and third quarter practice teaching are undertaken within UES, or in public school classrooms again taught by UES-trained teachers. Further, also in contrast to Teams E and S, Team L

trainees are assigned to master teachers for practice teaching by team faculty. For the other two teams, TEL coordinators unaffiliated with a specific team organize practice teaching and field observation assignments, and trainees are allowed to select their preferred master teachers from the available list, though at the time of selection their only acquaintance with master teachers normally is through contact made during the first quarter field observation, formally labelled Participation and Observation (P and O).

In Teams E and S not only is master teacher allocation decentralized to coordinators, but clinical courses are taught by practicing public school teachers recruited for their practical skills, not for their conceptual orientation. Neither is the question of conceptual orientation given priority in allocating trainees to master teachers. The latter are recruited primarily on the basis of principals' recommendations. Such recommendations typically derive from the reputation teachers develop for their effectiveness with children rather than from expertise in applying a given theoretical perspective to classroom teaching.

In practice, Team S students experience less disjuncture from the loosely coupled structure of training than do those in Team E. Despite the more or less random process of allocation to master teachers, and the practical emphasis in recruitment of clinical intructors, the probability of "fit" between teachers and trainees is relatively high for Team S students, given that team's eclectic orientation. For Team E, however, conceptual disjuncture follows inevitably from structural, given the scarcity of public school teachers actively committed to implementing a humanistic approach to classroom instruction.

The extent of association between variation in structural and conceptual integration is evidenced by responses to several questions,

two of which are reported on in the balance of this chapter. One of the two, asked in the second quarter when trainees were well into practice teaching, focused directly on the issue of conceptual homogeneity within teams, a condition related to the degree of conceptual integration between the various components of the training process. The question was:

> Is there a particular theoretical model or philosophy that you put into practice in your teaching?

Responses indicated very clear between-team differences, as discussed next.

Conceptual Homogeneity: Between Team Differences

As evidenced by data summarized in Table 5, the pattern of response to the above question was distinctive for each team. The only team whose members adopted the same conceptual approach to teaching was Team L.

Table 5

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS, BY TEAM, IN TERMS OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY APPLY A PARTICULAR THEORETICAL MODEL OR PHILOSOPHY TO CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Respondent has a Particular Model or Philosophy	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Yes: One	1	1	6	8
Yes: Two or More	1	4	0	5
No:	5	2	1	8

Team L, with its unitary behaviorist emphasis, produced trainees oriented toward behaviorism. Team S, committed to eclecticism, produced trainees who opted for two or more perspectives. Finally, Team E, oriented toward humanism, was relatively unsuccessful in securing a commitment to a humanistic emphasis or to any specific perspective, on the part of its trainees in the actual classroom setting.

Among Team E respondents there was a marked sense of discontinuity between the team's humanistic perspective and the perspective adopted by trainees themselves when working in actual classrooms under the supervision of master teachers, an outcome reflecting the scarcity of master teachers using the humanistic approach.

Summary

The experience of trainees within TEL evidently differs between teams. Associated with this difference is the fact that in one team, Team L, core tasks, both of classroom instruction and of teacher training are conceptualized in terms of a consistent technique, if not technology, of instruction. The focus is upon translating behavioristic theory into teaching practice, at least to the extent of formalizing procedural rules which become constitutive of the teaching task. Teacher training then becomes a process of systematically socializing trainees into the use of these rules. To socialize trainees in the practice of this "technology" requires conceptual unification, or integration, across all components of training, a requirement that in turn dictates structural integration, or centralized control, as we find with Team L. In effect, technology determines structure. (See Trist, et al., 1963.) Approaches to training in which theory is loosely coupled to practice, as with Team S, or where there really is disjuncture between theory and at least conventional practices, as with Team E, are associated with

loose coupling between training components. Consequences of between team differences in conceptual and structural integration are explored next.

TRAINEE SOCIALIZATION: SELF-MANAGEMENT VERSUS FACULTY CONTROL

An important issue raised by Bucher and Stelling's (1977) findings is whether between-team differences in degree of conceptual and structural integration of components of the training program are associated with differences in the ways students experience the various dimensions of the training process. Three key dimensions are self-management versus faculty management of training; role modeling versus role playing, and acceptance by trainees of staff evaluation of their teaching performance versus self-evaluation. Given the salience of these various dimensions within the overall process of professional socialization, each is explored in the present study, beginning with self-management.

To explore trainees' perceptions of the management of their learning, those interviewed were asked in their first quarter:

> From you first contacts with TEL, do you feel that you will have control over your learning experiences or that you will be controlled mostly by the faculty and staff?

The distribution of responses, by team, presented in Table 6, clearly separates trainees enrolled in Team L from those in Teams E and S.

Among trainees in Team L, the team most tightly integrated conceptually and structurally, there was a complete consensus that faculty and staff controlled learning experiences. Among trainees in the other two teams opinion divided, with just over one-half in Teams E and S viewing themselves as having substantial control. Underlying this rather dramatic difference between Team L and the other two teams is the same factor that constrains Team L toward tight conceptual and structural integration;

TABLE 6

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE CONTROL OVER THEIR LEARNING EXPERIENCES, BY TEAM

Source of Control	Team			Total
	E	S	L	
Faculty & Staff	3	3	8	14
Students Themselves	5	5	0	10

the distinctive character of the team's pedagogical technique.

This technique, incorporating behavorist reinforcement theory, is not only taught to trainees, but is the means by which they are taught, a factor constraining conceptual and structural integration of the training process, and the centralization of control in the team faculty, with little devolution of decision-making to trainees themselves. By contrast, Teams E and S take a more traditionally academic approach, allowing individual students a degree of autonomy in the selection, from among the options presented, of classroom practices they find congenial and the theory, or theories, that they find relevant to their needs.

Again, Team L emerges as being distinctive relative to Teams E and S. Students in Team L perceive themselves as being controlled by team faculty. This perception fits what one would anticipate from a team organized around a specific technology of instruction grounded in reinforcement theory. To quote a Team L student:

> "They definitely have a way of teaching and you more or less have to follow that way." (1-13-L4)[3]

Virtually all Team L members appeared very content to do just that.

Comments from Teams E and S were largely in the opposite direction, with a majority of students perceiving themselves to have a substantial amount of freedom to self-manage their progress through the training process. But for this self-management, there was a cost. Unlike trainees in Team L, those in Teams E and S gave few hints that they felt themselves to be undergoing a process of socialization into the systematized practices of what Lortie (1975) calls a "technical culture." On the contrary, the dominant references in trainees' comments were to the typical components of non-technical, academic training, such as readings, assignments, and projects. Technology influences structure. (See Miller and Rice, 1976, Trist, et al., 1963.) Relative absence of a technology of classroom instruction in the approaches of Teams E and S is associated with decentralized control, with students encouraged to find their own way at the level of teaching practice. In Team L, by contrast, presence of a technology is constitutive of tightly centralized control over all phases of training, and insistence upon students following the prescribed approach to teaching practice. Not surprisingly, therefore, as we shall see next, Team L trainees move toward acquisition of the teacher role by unitary role modeling. Members of the other two teams, by contrast, are more likely to adopt the eclectic approach of role-playing.

ROLE MODELING VERSUS ROLE PLAYING

In exploring processes of role acquisition, Bucher and Stelling (1977) found that some of the students they studied identified with a single admired exemplar whom they took as a role model. The majority of their students, however, adopted a more eclectic approach, selecting admired characteristics from a variety of professional practitioners as a basis for their own role performances. This latter approach Bucher and Stelling (1977) label role-playing.

Among TEL trainees one finds a parallel dichotomy, though the distinction between role modelers and role players is formulated on a somewhat different basis. Within TEL, trainees work with at least two master teachers; one in the second, another in the third quarter. The expectation, of course, is that the master teachers, selected as exemplars of the teacher role, will be so viewed by trainees, thus serving as role models whom trainees will emulate in carrying out the array of activities required for skillful exercise of classroom leadership.

Whether or not trainees did, in fact, view their master teachers as role models is determined by responses to two questions. One, asked in the second quarter, elicited information regarding the degree of compatibility between trainees and master teachers. While most had compatible relationships, four did not, an issue to which we return later. The second question relevant to role modeling was asked in the third quarter. Trainees were asked to name teachers whom they viewed as exemplars of the teacher role. It was presumed that role modelers would name at least one of their master teachers. The specific question was:

> Could you name two or three teachers whom you consider to be outstanding exemplars of a professional teacher?

The pattern of response, shown in Table 7, is of particular interest in two respects. First, looking at the distribution of responses in the "Total" column shows that a majority did identify master teachers as exemplars, and therefore probably engaged in <u>role modeling</u> rather than <u>role playing</u>, an outcome contrary to the experience of students studied by Bucher and Stelling (1977). However, the reason why a majority of trainees end up in the top category of Table 7 is due to the second interesting finding presented in the table: the fact that <u>all</u> Team L respondents cited master teachers as being exemplary role models.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF TRAINEES IN TERMS OF WHETHER THEY IDENTIFIED MASTER TEACHERS, OR OTHER TEACHERS, AS EXEMPLARY ROLE MODELS

Identified as Exemplary Teachers	TEAM			TOTAL
	F	S	L	
Master Teacher(s)	2	3	8	13
Other Teachers Only	3	4	0	7
None	1	0	0	1

Between-Team Differences

Inclusion by all Team L trainees of master teachers in the "exemplary teacher" category, in contrast to trainees in Teams E and S, suggests that role modeling is the preferred approach to role acquisition in Team L, while role playing takes precedence in Teams E and S.

Underlying these between-team differences is the same factor acting to pull the training process in Team L toward centralized faculty control; the Team's commitment to a distinctive "technology" of teaching. Master teachers working with Team L trainees, unlike most master teachers working with trainees from Teams E and S, have the advantage of being able to draw upon theoretically grounded procedural rules to positively reinforce pupil learning and classroom conduct. The Team L master teachers systematically induct their trainees into the use of these rules.

Lack of a distinctive technology of teaching in Teams E and S was associated with the relatively weak structural and conceptual integration of the components of training in these two teams as compared with Team L, constraining Team E and Team S students toward role playing rather than role modeling.

The degree of integration among the various components of the training process proved also to be the most important factor associated with another dimension of trainee-master teacher relationships; the dimension of interpersonal compatability.

Trainee-Master Teacher Compatibility

Clearly, the probability of trainees ending up in situations where they find themselves at odds with their master teachers are enhanced in those teams which lack both centralized control by team faculty and conceptual integration of team faculty with master teachers. Evidence of actual incompatibility emerged when trainees were asked, in their second quarter:

Do you feel comfortable with your master teacher?

The pattern of response to this question is presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF TRAINEES INTERVIEWED IN TERMS OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY WERE COMFORTABLE WORKING WITH THEIR MASTER TEACHER IN THE SECOND QUARTER OF TRAINING

Comfortable With Master Teacher	TEAM E	S	L	TOTAL
YES	4	5	7	16
NO	2	2	0	4
N.R.	1	0	0	1

Again, Team L trainees emerge as a distinctive group, all reporting compatible relations with their second quarter master teachers. In Teams E and S, by contrast, while the majority of trainees also had good relationships with their master teachers, two in each team did not. It

is perhaps surprising that there were not more, given the lack of formal structural and conceptual integration between faculty and master teachers in Teams E and S.

Given the impact of program integration, and level of instructional technology, upon students' management of training and approach to role acquisition, one would anticipate a parallel impact upon evaluation, the third of Bucher and Stelling's (1977) socialization processes.

SELF VERSUS STAFF EVALUATION

As with the other major dimensions of professional socialization--self versus staff management of learning, and role modeling versus role playing--interview data from TEL trainees shows that they also differed markedly from the students studied by Bucher and Stelling (1977) on the dimension of self versus staff evaluation. Bucher and Stelling's students, as so often happens among subordinate groups (see Homans, 1950), generated their own norm with regard to what constitutes successful role performance. The norm criterion, which students used as a basis for self-validation, was taken to be the ability to deal with a case, or problem, independently, without having to turn to other persons for help. No such norm, defining successful role performance, emerged among TEL trainees. The only evidence of a tendency toward self-validation of role performance was among the four students who, as noted earlier, had poor relationships with their second quarter master teachers. For the most part, as we shall see, TEL students focused their attention upon satisfying their master teachers. These, after all, were the persons upon whom trainees depended for a good rating. These ratings were included in students' files, available to prospective employers. Bucher and Stelling's students, by contrast, were not dependent upon individual supervisors' evaluations. Their

final certification was by exams and/or dissertations.

While some TEL students were quite critical of the evaluations they received, the dominant issue that emerged in the course of interviews was the grading practice imposed by TEL. To evaluate student teaching TEL requires master teachers to score their students on a 21 item check list. Items are grouped in five categories, as follows:

1. Instructional planning skills
2. Presentation skills
3. Classroom management skills
4. Evaluation skills and student achievement
5. Professional responsibility and interpersonal relationships.

Each item on the check list is scored from 5 (exceptional) to 1 (not acceptable). This five-level scoring system caused problems both for students and master teachers. The main difficulty derived from ambiguity regarding the meaning of a 5. TEL staff instructed master teachers to treat 4, 3, 2, and 1 as equivalent to A, B, C, and D, with 5 reserved for the occasional outstanding trainee performance. Further, 5s were strongly discouraged for the first quarter of student teaching. However, some master teachers disregarded this policy and gave their students 5s, creating a feeling among students who received 4s that they were being discriminated against.

Debate over the problem of 5s was sufficiently intense to dominate discussion during the section of student interviews directed to questions regarding evaluation, possibly obscuring other issues. Information about student response to evaluation was generated by three questions asked in the course of third quarter interviews with regard to student experiences during their second quarter in the program. These were:

1. Did you expect the evaluation you got last quarter?

2. Was it fair?

3. In general, how do you feel about the way that you were evaluated?

The first of these questions, which we turn to next, tapped trainees' sense of the degree to which they and their master teachers were more or less in agreement on the score assigned.

Student Expectations

The pattern of student response to the question regarding their expected grade is presented in Table 9. Again, as with previous questions, respondents from Team L were distinctive relative to those from Teams E and S.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF TRAINEES' OPINION OF THEIR SECOND QUARTER STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION

TRAINEE'S OPINION	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Better than expected	0	0	4	4
As expected	4	4	3	11
Not expected	1	2	0	3

Team L trainees once more generated their own unique pattern of response, four of the seven reporting better than expected evaluations. This outcome appears to be associated with a heavy emphasis among Team L master teachers upon the evaluation process, with the evaluation procedure being administered on as many as three occasions prior to the final end of quarter assessment. On each occasion trainees were asked to first score themselves

on all 21 items on the evaluation form. Discrepancies between student and master teacher scores then were negotiated. This procedure seemed to generate a relatively low expectation of their final scores among some trainees.

Fairness of Evaluations

Trainees' judgment of the equity of their second quarter practice teaching evaluation scores finds expression in their response to the second of the two third quarter questions addressing the evaluation issue. The question simply asked: "Was it fair?" Again, a distinctive pattern of response emerged, though the overall sentiment was clearly positive. As indicated by the data summarized in Table 10, of the eighteen respondents to the evaluation question, fourteen, or 77 percent, believed their evaluation to have been fair.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF TRAINEES' OPINION REGARDING THE FAIRNESS OF THEIR SECOND QUARTER EVALUATION

	TEAM			TOTAL
TRAINEE'S OPINION	E	S	I	
Fair	4	3	7	14
Unfair	2	2	0	4

As shown in Table 10, the four trainees who viewed their second quarter evaluation as unfair were concentrated in Teams E and S. Predictably, three of the four were the students discussed earlier who had had bad relations with their master teachers, and were also those who received "not expected" evaluations, as indicated in Table 9.

Overall, however, the great majority of trainees interviewed raised no objections to their second quarter evaluations. The actual process of evaluation did evoke strongly negative reaction, as we see next.

The Evaluation Process

The third question addressed to trainees regarding evaluation asked:

> In general, how do you feel about the way that you were evaluated?

Response to this question was predominantly negative, as shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION, BY TEAM, OF TRAINEES' FEELINGS ABOUT HOW THEY WERE EVALUATED AS STUDENT TEACHERS

RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Positive	2	1	4	7
Negative	3	6	3	12

The major source of negative feeling about the evaluation process was, as noted earlier, student dissatisfaction with the numbering system. As the evaluation sheet included 5 as the top assessment rating, students receiving less felt that, in effect, they were being assigned less than an A rating. While this in itself may not have been problematic, resentment developed when students became aware that their own master teachers might have given them 5s, but TEL staff instructed them not to. In effect, students felt that though a 5 may have been earned, TEL's assessment policy denied them this rating. Exacerbating student sentiment

over the issue was student perception of the employment market as becoming increasingly restricted, with selection into teaching positions being extremely competitive.

Despite their criticism of the evaluation process, most trainees interviewed felt that their actual evaluation was fair, as evidenced by the data presented in Tables 9 and 10. Whether the structure of the evaluation form influenced what trainees were taught, and what they learned, is difficult to determine. However, questions asked in the third quarter throw some light on this issue, to which we turn next.

PROGRAM IMPACT

A problem with student evaluation is that while it assesses the trainee it is of limited utility in determining the impact of the actual training. Trainees may have possessed given competencies prior to entering TEL, or have acquired them outside the program. To gain insight into these latter possitilities two questions were addressed to trainees in their third quarter interviews:

1. At this point, what do you see your teaching strengths and weaknesses to be?

2. Which of the strengths you mentioned do you feel that you developed through training, and which did you begin with anyway?

Responses regarding strengths that students felt they actually acquired through their training were coded in terms of Gordon and Adler's (1963)[4] dimensions of classroom leadership, with the results shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

TRAINEES' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING STRENGTHS DEVELOPED THROUGH THEIR TRAINING

Classroom Leadership Dimension	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Task	0	2	6	8
Expressive	3	3	0	6
Authority	0	1	2	3
None	2	0	0	2

Overall, it is apparent that nearly all trainees did feel that they acquired specific teaching skills through their training. However, as with previous data, once again we find a distinctive pattern of between-team differences regarding types of skills acquired. Respondents in Team L concentrate in the task leadership dimension; in Team S they divide between task and expressive leadership, while those in Team E are concentrated in the expressive dimension. Further, while no Team L or S trainees responded negatively, two of those interviewed from Team E did express negative views. Significantly, both were among the four trainees who ran into problems while working with their second quarter master teachers.

In presenting trainees comments related to the categories of Table 12, first we turn to Team L, most of whose respondents felt that the distinctive strengths they had acquired from their experiences with TEL were in the area of task leadership.

TEAM L

Task Leadership

My strengths are organization and analysis.. . . The master teacher looks critically and picks out things that I don't see . . . she has helped me to be more thorough. (3-2a,b-L1)

Application of learning theory. My use of it, my preparation and my dedication. (3-2a-L2)

My strengths are that I am usually able to build in transfer; to analyze what went right and wrong. (3-2a-L3)

I feel pretty confident about how to teach.. . . I got all of how to teach from the training . . . basic things, like how to model and check for understanding; organization, setting the expectation or purpose, I learned from the training. (3-2a,b-L5)

I am able to recognize the good things that the kids do.. . . It changes their attitudes for you to be positive. It makes them feel better and makes them want to try.. . . They really have worked hard, so I think that is a strength. Being positive was part of my nature, but at UES I was taught how to make that part of my teaching. (3-2a,b-L6)

I feel more comfortable with the kids as a result of the training. I act more like a teacher than just someone they can talk to. I can be more directive. (3-2a,b-L3)

Authority

I can pretty much control them. I don't have to get firm that often.. . . The control, and theories that I have learned, are definitely helpful. They work. (3-2a,b-L4)

The control aspect of teaching is still not a great strength of mine, but I think that it has been developed tremendously through the program. (3-2a,b-L7)

In contrast to the distribution of responses from members of Team L, those from Teams E and S reflect relatively more emphasis upon expressive leadership. We turn first to Team E.

TEAM E

Expressive Leadership

> My strength is that I want to teach. I've always been into helping students.. . . One thing I didn't expect to get from the program is that I learned a lot about myself and my students. I know what has to be done if you want to be a good teacher. [Practice teaching] has prepared me most of all. (3-2s,b-E2)

> Strengths are my willingness to adapt to each kid's needs and individualize.. . . Mostly it came through training. (3-2s,b-E5)

> I tend to fall in love with kids very fast, but I don't think that I need that much from them--at least I try not to because that could be very dangerous.. . . I've never been a real rigid person, but I have learned how to apply that to teaching. I've learned how to try different things. (3-2a,b-E1)

Negative Responses

Team E trainees interviewed made no comments regarding teaching strengths that could be coded in either the task or authority dimensions of classroom leadership. However, two trainees adopted a negative orientation, in the sense that they would not acknowledge having acquired any new teaching strengths in the course of their training. Both had experienced problems working with their second quarter master teacher, as noted earlier.

Finally, turning to the responses of members of Team S, we find that they fall closer to the pattern of response in Team E than in Team L, as shown in Table Actual students' comments were as follows:

TEAM S

Task Leadership

> I was taught very differently (in grade school). Everyone did the same thing at the same time. There weren't special projects for anybody. I've gotten a lot of that through the program. (3-2b,c-S6)

> I developed confidence. I've always known that I could handle kids. I developed . . . before it was just sort of ignorance. (3-2b-S8)

Expressive Leadership

> I think I pretty much had a positive view of working with children. It is enhanced by working with different teachers. (3-2b-S1)
>
> Flexibility. I realize that you have to mold to the student.. . . I learned that through my student teaching. (3-2b-S2)
>
> Being enthusiastic and dramatic I got from my second quarter master teacher, and the composure from the third quarter teacher. I don't look at my second quarter as being very helpful. (3-2b-S7)

Authority

> My strength is definitely positive reinforcement. I have a special case, an EMR class. This class is very well disciplined.. . . The master teacher has helped me with classroom control. She has given me the pointers. (3-2a,3b-S4)

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the views of trainees themselves regarding what they learned differentiate Team L from Teams E and S. First, Team L respondents are much more likely than members of the other two teams to feel that they have acquired task leadership skills. This finding takes on special importance in relation to the data presented earlier in Table 3. These latter data show that task leadership techniques ranked first among aspects of teaching that trainees felt they needed to learn to be effective classroom teachers. Apparently Team L is the team with the highest probability of responding to trainees' felt need for task leadership skills.

Of course, whether acquisition of desired skills while participating in teacher education leads trainees to maintain a positive evaluation of their professional training after they have gained further experience is an issue requiring further study. However, predictive of positive findings in this regard are data on the basis of recruitment into the TEL program. When

respondents were asked why they selected TEL for their professional training, replies fell into the pattern presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR CHOOSING TEL FOR TEACHER TRAINING, BY TEAM

REASON GIVEN	TEAM			TOTAL
	E	S	L	
Attended UCLA as undergraduate	4	6	1	11
Wanted a specific team	0	0	6	6
Close to home	1	1	1	3
Like team structure	1	1	0	2
Helps job chances	1	0	0	1
No Reply	1	0	0	1

Clearly, the dominant reason for applying to TEL was familiarity with UCLA, close to half the respondents having been at the University as undergraduates. However, Team L again is distinctive, six of its eight respondents having been motivated to apply to TEL because they specifically wanted to train at UES. The reasons given are worth quoting as they provide insight into the widespread reputation of UES as a center of exemplary teaching. Students' comments included:

> In my school district they are very much Team L oriented . . . . The more I learned about it the more I thought it fitted my . . . philosophy of education. (1-8-L2)
>
> I wanted to student teach at UES. (1-7-L4)
>
> I talked to my advisor about it. He sent me to another faculty member. He said: 'Go to UCLA because it is more metropolitan, and if you go to UCLA, get on Team L. I don't care how you do it, just do it. (1-7-L8)

> I went here as an undergraduate. I had heard really good things about UES. (1-7-L6)
>
> I had gone to undergraduate here and I had worked at UES. I wanted so badly to get into the UES program. I didn't even apply anywhere else. (1-7-L7)
>
> A friend of mine went through the same program and team . . . . After she told me about this particular program I decided that this was where I would like to try out and teach. (1-6-L3)

Evidently, the positive impact of Team L has been retained by former students well beyond the conclusion of their training period, creating a climate of opinion that impacts the recruitment process. Further evidence for the persistence of positive feeling about Team L emerged when respondents were asked how they came to choose their specific teams. Among the eight members of Team E, the humanistic team, six reported making their choice on the basis of the published team description. Of the eight interviewees in Team S, the standard team, seven did not make the team their first choice, but were allocated to the team because their first choices were closed out. For four of these students, their first choice actually was Team L. Finally, when the Team L students were asked how they came to choose their team, five said they did so because of recommendations from persons they knew, and two made their choice as a result of working at UES while undergraduates.

Summary

To return to the beginning, the study reported here was prompted by the fact that practicing teachers typically place little value upon their formal teacher education. Most teachers attribute their skills to classroom experience. Lortie (1975) proposes two hypotheses that might account for this. One, that training is experienced as redundant because teacher trainees

already have served a sixteen year apprenticeship to the teaching task. The other, that teacher education makes little impact because it is based upon at best a weak technology of instruction. Our data speak to both hypotheses.

With reference to Lortie's first hypothesis, data presented here regarding trainees' expectations of teacher education show that while trainees' experience in school shaped their perception of the teacher role, this same experience also left them with a strong sense that they lacked skills required for at least one major dimension of that role; the dimension of task leadership.

With reference to Lortie's second hypothesis, the case study data are supportive of its implicit linkage of trainees' positive assessment of training with the extent to which such training inducts students into a distinctive technology, and "technical culture." Findings show that while respondents viewed task leadership skills as their priority need, those enrolled in Team L, the behavioristic team, were more likely than members of other teams to perceive themselves as having acquired task leadership skills from their training.

Related to this outcome is the fact that, among the three teams studied, only Team L conceptualized teaching in terms of a distinctive, theoretically grounded, technique. In Team L the teaching task is viewed as being based upon procedural rules which structure teacher activity in ways intended to reinforce learning behaviors in pupils, and also social behavior supportive of a positive learning environment.

The training of prospective teachers in Team L's distinctive approach to the teaching task is facilitated by the fact that the team's commitment to a technology of instruction finds expression in tight conceptual and

structural integration of all aspects of the training process. In this we have another example of technology influencing, if not entirely determining, structure.

While the findings presented here obviously are tentative, they are remarkably consistent. At each step in the analysis we find a similar pattern of between-team variation with Team L at one extreme, Team E at the other, and Team S either in the middle, or falling toward Team E. This consistency is sufficiently compelling to provide a point of departure for larger studies, involving more students and multiple sites.

Regarding future research, it is not only the substantive findings of the present study that are relevant. Equally important are the theoretical perspectives. This study demonstrates the utility of Bucher and Stelling's (1977) conceptualization of the process of professional socialization as a framework for analysing the process of becoming a teacher. The study also demonstrates the validity, and utility, of Gordon and Adler's (1963) conceptualization of the teacher role in terms of three dimensions of classroom leadership.

Among the leadership dimensions, task leadership was the one most sought by the teacher trainees interviewed. Acquisition of task leadership skills seems to be facilitated when training is based upon a behavioristic, task oriented, technology of instruction. The more developed the technology of instruction, the more training is likely to be oriented toward a "programmed" rather than "voluntaristic" model of professional socialization.

Apparently, however, one cannot generalize this conclusion to all types of professional education. While a programmed model of training may require, as a necessary condition, a developed technology, the latter is not a sufficient condition. For example, Bucher and Stelling's (1977) students were being trained for roles in such technologically grounded fields as biochemistry, internal

medicine, and psychiatry. In each of these fields professional practice is grounded in tested knowledge. Training for each, as Bucher and Stelling (1977) report, is well integrated, conceptually and structurally, as is the training of teacher education students in Team L. Despite these parallels between Team L and Bucher and Stelling's (1977) trainees, the latter adopted a voluntaristic, or self-management, approach to professional role acquisition in contrast to the deterministic, or faculty controlled approach characteristic of Team L. Associated with this difference in approach of the two groups of trainees is the great difference in the nature of the professional roles for which their trainees were being prepared.

Illustrative of the type of role toward which Bucher and Stelling's (1977) students were moving is the authors' description of the graduate students in bio-chemistry. As Bucher and Stelling (1977: 93) report:

> For the most part, these students chose problems for which, according to them, their advisors could give them little technical assistance. Occasionally they reported seeking help from other faculty and students, but the principal way they proceeded was to seek out whatever help was available in the literature, and then try the methods themselves until they either got them to work or gave up. Learning, mastering, and, in some cases, devising the necessary methods and techniques was an important and time-consuming part of the research process.

Clearly, the learning experience described here is for a research, or possibly a clinical, type role. Temporal constraints are not in evidence. Teacher trainees, by contrast, are preparing for a professional role enacted in classroom settings where temporal constraints predominate. Immediate action is called for, rather than reflective evaluation of possible alternative approaches. In a sense, taking the automobile as an example, teachers are like drivers, having to respond immedicately to constantly varying challenges. Induction into the driver role typically involves driver trainees working under the direct control of experienced instructors.

Students studied by Bucher and Stelling (1977) are more like the designers of automobiles, and maintenance technicians. They, unlike the drivers, have the luxury of trying alternative approaches to design or repair problems. Designers and technicians, like bio-chemists and doctors, are judged primarily on the outcome of their work. Drivers, and teachers, are more likely to be held accountable for the way they work; for the quality of their conduct of the work process.

Appropriately, therefore, the training of designers and technicians, or of researchers, focusses upon theory, with a good deal of freedom being given trainees for self-managed exploration of practical applications. Training of teachers, on the other hand, appropriately focusses upon supervised practice, with theory being introduced in a supportive capacity. Our data suggest that the specific type of practice teacher trainees are most likely to seek relates to task leadership skills. When training in such skills is made available, teacher trainees, like student drivers, appear very willing to put themselves under the direction of faculty and master teachers, trading voluntarism for faculty control.

FOOTNOTES

1. The distinction between volitional and deterministic approaches to human behavior is emphasized in Kantian epistemology, which is based upon the distinction between practical (moral) and theoretical (instrumental) reason, or rationality.

For Kant, practical reason structures man's inner world, legislating the morality underlying the choices each individual makes as he, or she, negotiates daily progress through multiple interactions with family members, friends, and colleagues at work. Inherent in the notion of moral choice is freedom of the will, or volition.

Theoretical reason, by contrast, structures our experience of the outer, or phenomenal, world, allowing us to uncover the lawful, or deterministic, interrelationships among phenomena. The phenomenal world, lacking volitional agents, is relatively predictable to the extent that science uncovers its underlying laws.

For sociology, in developing a perspective on human behavior, an abiding problem is whether, and under what conditions, to view man's social conduct as grounded in freedom of choice, the volitional option, or as determined by environmental pressures, the deterministic position. Theories based upon a volitional perspective seek to advance <u>understanding</u> of social relationships and social action. Deterministic theories, by contrast, follow the positivist, or natural science, tradition, seeking to establish the laws assumed to govern social phenomena. Realization of this nomological objective holds the promise of facilitating prediction and control in the social realm paralleling that now possible in the realm of the physical.

One example of the tension that exists between volitional and deterministic theories in the social sciences is provided by Giddens' (1976) discussion of the sociological writings of Talcott Parsons. Giddens (1976) argues that Parsons early work represents a volitional, or voluntaristic, approach to social analysis. For Parsons:

> . . . . voluntarism is counterposed to 'positivism', the latter connoting nineteenth century forms of social theory which sought to eschew all references to the acting subject as a moral actor, the former, those in which the acting subject is placed in the forefront.
>
> The use of the term 'voluntarism' suggests that Parsons wished to try to build into his own approach a conception of the actor as a creative innovative agent, thus seeking to break with schemes in which human conduct is not conceptually differentiated from the movement of objects in nature (Giddens, 1976: 95).

2. There is some ambiguity in the literature regarding the concept of authority. Gordon and Adler (1963) follow Willard Waller (1968) in incorporating authority into the leadership function of the teacher role. The latter labelled the exercise of authority "positional" leadership, in contrast to personal, or expressive, leadership. On the other hand, for Bendix (1962) leadership is differentiated from authority. In discussing Max Weber's writings on charisma, Bendix (1962: 298) quotes Bierstedt's (1954: 71-72) distinction between leadership and authority, citing the latter's comments:

> A leader can only request, authority can require . . . . Leadership depends upon the personal qualities of the leader in the situation in which he leads. In the case of authority, however, the relationship ceases to be personal and, if the legitimacy of the authority is recognized, the subordinate must obey the command even when he is unacquainted with the person who issues it. In a leadership relation the person is basic; in an authority relation the person is merely a symbol.

3. Quotations from interviews are coded according to a system allowing for identification of the academic quarter in which the interview was

conducted, the number of the question asked, the respondent's team within TEL, and the identity of the team member. For example, a code such as 1-6-E5 refers to an interview conducted in the first quarter of the 1978-79 academic year; question number 6; and a Team E respondent designated by code number 5.

4. The major findings of Gordon and Adler (1963) are reported in Boocock (1972).

REFERENCES

Bales, R.F. Roles in problem-solving groups. In E.F. Maccoby, T.W. Newcomb, & E.L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology (3rd. Ed.). New York: Henry Holt, 1958.

Bendix, R. Max Weber: An intellectual portrait. New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., Anchor Books, 1962.

Bierstedt, R. The problem of authority. In M. Berger, T. Abel, & C. Page (Eds.), Freedom and control in modern society. New York: D. Van Nostrand, Inc., 1954.

Boocock, S.S. An introduction to the sociology of learning. Boston: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1972

Bucher, R., and Stelling, J.G. Becoming professional. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

Doyle, W. Manking managerial decisions in classrooms. In D.L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management, 78th Yearbook, NSSE, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Fuller, F.F., & Brown, O. Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education, 74th Yearbook, NSSE, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Giddens, A. New Rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretive sociologies. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Gordon, C.W., & Adler, L.M. Dimensions of teacher leadership in classroom social systems. Los Angeles: University of California, Department of Education, 1963 (Mimeo). (Summarized in Boocock, 1972, pp. 143-149).

Homans, G.C. The human group. New York: Harcourt,Brace, 1950.

Lortie, D.C. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Miller, E.J., & Rice, A.K. Systems of organization: Task and sentient systems and their boundary control. London: Tavistock Publications, 1967.

Olesen, V.L., & Whittaker, E.W. The silent dialogue. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Thayer, G. Handbook for supervising teachers. Los Angeles: University of California, Graduate School of Education, Teacher Education Laboratory, 1978.

Trist, E.L., Higgin, G.W., Murray, H., & Pollock, A.B. Organizational Choice. London: Tavistock Publications, 1963.

Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Science Editions, 1965.